

# COALITION OF CONNECTICUT SPORTSMEN

P.O. Box 2506, Hartford, CT 06146, (203) 245-8076

[ccsct@comcast.net](mailto:ccsct@comcast.net) 203 245-8076

Testimony to the Judiciary Committee

Raised Bill No.7028 AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION, ACCESS TO THE FIREARMS DATABASE BY PAROLE OFFICERS AND PRESENTATION OF A CARRY PERMIT: **OPPOSE**

Prepared by James Crook

March 20, 2015

Good morning Senators Coleman and Kissel, Representatives Tong and Rebimbas and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee.

My name is James Crook and I am here today representing the Coalition of CT Sportsmen (CCS).

First we would like to thank Governor Malloy for disarming our constituents by stating that he doesn't believe there's an appetite to open the debate on gun control. Second, we only oppose four lines in Raised Bill No. 7028. They are lines 454 and lines 468 – 470.

We agree that parolee access to firearms is a risk to Parole Officers and all CT residents. However, the addition of line 454 is completely unnecessary for several reasons. Requiring "sponsors" to swear to and sign a legal document certifying that there are no firearms in the residence would be more thorough, in that it would account for all firearms (documented and undocumented). It must also be stated that perjury will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. As we stated last week through verbal testimony not all legally owned firearms require an individual to obtain a firearms permit. There are many citizens of CT who own legally own firearms yet cannot carry a handgun or purchase any new firearms. These firearms are owned for both home perfection and hunting, few will show up on the firearms database.

Access to the firearms database will only provide Parole Officers with incomplete information and a false sense of security. Not only does it ignore many legally owned firearms, the Parole Officer will still be relying on the verbal statement of the "sponsor" which ignores any illegal firearms in the residence. To this we beg the state to start prosecuting all crimes involving firearms to the fullest extent.

Lines 468 – 470 are unnecessary, vague and unconstitutional! We believe that the original intent of 29-35(b) was to provide proof of permit to law enforcement once a legally owned firearm was discharged or probable cause had been determined. Remember, owning and carrying a firearm in the open is legal in CT. Unless rewritten this proposed bill as written is in violation of the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> amendments.

We look forward to testifying on this bill and last week's bills in the Public Safety Committee at a later date. Thank you all again for listening and I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.